(2) Deaths of three men who perched on trees near Sampangi Stadium due to leakage of Electric Current.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is another adjournment motion tabled by the same Member, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy, which is as follows:

"That this House do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of public importance and of recent occurrence, to wit, the situation arising out of the death of three persons due to the failure of the Government in not preventing persons from sitting on trees near which pass electric wires near Sampangi Stadium in Bangalore, on the last day when American Free Style Wrestling was going on."

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ).—ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಅನಾಹುತಕ್ಕೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಸಾವುಗಳಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಅನೇಕಸಾರಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದಂತೂ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಜನರು ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟೇಡಿಯಂ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇತ್ತೀಚಿನ ಘಟನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು. ಇದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಕಾರ್ಯನೀತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

It is of public importance and hence I desire that this House do stand adjourned to discuss it.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—These are things which happen many a time on account of the fault of the persons themselves. These three persons wanted to have a look at the match without payment. Therefore, if they deliberately put themselves in a position of danger, I would like to appeal to the House to see what Government can do in the matter. So far as the Electrical Department is concerned, they are doing things in order to ensure safety; they will be glad to accept the suggestion and everything needed will be done and it is being done. Therefore, I do not think that this is of such urgent nature or of such public importance as to deserve the time of the House by way of discussion on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This seems to be obviously an accident for which the persons who died have been themselves, I am sorry to say, responsible. In any case this is not a matter of such public importance or ugency as to require interruption of appointed business. This is therefore disallowed.

ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953.

Motion to approve proposal to introduce in Parliament.

(Continued)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now general debate on the Andhra State Bill.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY (Yelandur).—The Andhra State Bill is a memorable piece of legislation in the history of India since it inaugurates the redistribution of provinces on the basis of language without at the same time ignoring the other equally important factors such as the geographical contiguity, cultural affinity, economic self-sufficiency, financial stability and administrative convenience. As all of you know, the existing provincial divisions are largely the creations of the Britishers not to satisfy the wishes of the people, but to suit their own imperialistic design. The present provincial barriers have kept people speaking different languages in different provinces, thus resulting in the destruction of their natural amity.

The policy of "Divide and Rule" of the Britisher has been fully applied in the provincial division in order to maintain an iron grip over the administration. The history of the partition of Bengal in 1905 is quite clear on this point. It was stated in a secret communication by Lord Hardinge to the Secretary of State that the partition was entirely meant not for administrative conveniences, but only for putting Bengal under check. A resolution passed in the Jaipur Congress has given reasons why the formation of linguistic provinces was inevitable:

"The Congress approval of this principle was partly due to the artificial manner in which existing provinces have been created by the

(Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.)

British power in India. It was chiefly due to a desire to have as far as possible homogeneous cultural units which would presumably advance more rapidly because of this homogeneity".

Even the authors of the Montford Report admitted that "the present map of British India was shaped by military, political or administrative exigencies or conveniences of the moment with small regard to the actual affinities or wishes of the people."

Therefore, under these circumstances an added responsibility devolved upon the Government of India to liberate the people from the system of British bondage by redistributing the provinces on a rational basis. The Andhra State Bill tries to mitigate this evil to a certain extent. The separation of the Telugu-speaking people to form themselves into a separate unit, the handing over of Kannada-speaking territories to the adjoining Mysore State and allowing the Tamil-speaking people to remain in the residuary Madras State bring into existence homogeneous linguistic units required of a federation. We are living in a country with a democratic federal Government at the centre and representing the glory and might of the whole and constituent states as its unit enjoying internal autonomy. The nature of a unit in a federation is of paramount importance. As far as possible, a unit in a federation must be homogeneous and not heterogeneous in character. "To treat the existing province as the federating units would" as rightly pointed out by Professor D. R. Gadgil, Director of Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, "not only be meaningless but also positively harmful. A large number of these units are so composite in character as to be potential federations in themselves, and in a number of instances, there is no hemogeneity of sentiment or interest between all their parts. If the federal structure is to be raised on a basis that is durable. the settling of provincial constitutions must be done by units which are homogeneous, which have a feeling of distinct identity among themselves and which represent a common way of thinking". Since language is an important factor in indicating distinct culture, common tradition and a common way of thinking; a linguistic area would be the most appropriate unit in a federation. Even according to constitutional experts, the concept of linguistic provinces is not a dogma or a shibboleth, but is a political necessity and a logical prerequisite of a federal form of Government.

Another important feature of this Bill is, as stated in its objective clause, that by increasing the area of the State of Mysore and by the formation of Andhra State and by diminishing the areas of the Madras State, it will bring into existence as far as possible a sort of uniformity in the size of these three States which of course is in conformity with federal principles. As we now see, there are provinces which are too big and there are provinces which are too small. What naturally happens is that provinces which are very big have got a good number of representatives in the Central Parliament, and so much so, two or three big provinces combined together will dictate policies for entire India and the smaller states will have no voice. For example, Madras and the United Provinces are each bigger in size than Italy. The Central Provinces and the United Provinces each exceed Great Britain in size. Orissa is more or less equal in size to Portugal. So far as population is concerned, the population of Madras and the United Provinces each exceed that of Great Britain. It is inevitable under these circumstances that provinces in a federation must be, as far as possible, uniform in size. Otherwise it will be possible for the larger units to have a predominant influence in legislation on account of their larger representations in the Lower House of the Central Legislature. As a protection to the smaller units against the dominance of the larger units some provisions are made in the Constitution. In the Constitution of the United States of America, Switzerland, Australia and

U.S.S.R. equal number of seats have been provided to the constituent states in the second chamber. Such a provision has not been made for equal representation to the Council of States in Indian Constitution. Further, the constitution of the United States of America goes further and gives some important powers to the Senate which is denied even to the House of Representatives, *i.e.*, the Senate may refuse to give its consent for the appointments made or the treaties effected by the President. Such constitutional safeguards have not been given to the States in India. The diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the formation of the State of Andhra secure administrative efficiency and convenience. The present unwieldy provinces are almost a disadvantage, even so far as the administrative conveniences are concerned. The existence of these big provinces is a great nuisance to the people especially to those who are living in the border areas. While devising a province, care must be taken, especially in a country where poor people are living, that no district is removed far away from the provincial headquarters. That has been neglected in the present division of provinces. As observed by the authors of the Montford Reforms, " We cannot doubt......"

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I have to go now and then for a minute or two, to attend to trunk calls, etc. Thereby, I do not mean any disrespect to the House and during such absence, my Hon'ble colleague will be present.

SRI M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—As I was saying, the authors of the Montford Reforms have stated that " We cannot doubt that the business of Government would be simplified if administrative units were both smaller and more homogeneous ; and when we bear in mind the prospect of the immense burdens of Government in India being transferred to comparatively inexperienced hands such considerations acquire additional weight...' Even the Simon Commission, which reported in the year 1930, held the same view. The Commission stated that 'most of them (the Provinces) are too populous and extensive, having regard to the cultural level and economic conditions of their inhabitants, to allow of the easy working of the machinery of representative government on a reasonably extensive franchise.

Referring to the Madras Presidency, as early as 1903, Mr. H. H. Risley, Secretary, Home Department, wrote that " the Government of Madras have repeatedly complained of the anxieties imposed upon their administration, of the great diversity of languages, Oriya, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kanarese with which Madras civilians are called upon to cope and which render the transfer of officers from one part of the Presidency to another a matter in any case of great difficulty and often of positive detriment to the public interest. These disadvantages exercise an injurious effect not only upon the administration, but still more upon the people, Hence in dealing with a question of this kind, it may be that the true criterion of territorial redistribution should be sought not in race but in language."

10 A.M.

Another important feature of the Bill is that it renders the function of democracy very easy since it aims at bringing into existence Linguistic Provinces. It is impossible to develop a democratic form of government or to achieve genuine nationhood on the basis of existing provincial divisions, inherited from the Britishers fashioned to suit their autocratic rule. In the Legislative Assembly, especially in a province where there are a variety of languages. a member is not expected to speak in all languages. If freedom of language is given, to speak in a language which he knows, what one member speaks will not be understood by other members. This will lead to an anomalous position. On September 11th, 1947, there was the instance of the Bombay Legislative Assembly, where the Speaker allowed members to speak in any recognised provincial language bearing in mind that what they spoke was not meant for their own satisfac-

(SRI M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.)

tion but to make themselves understood by others. The Minister concerned piloted the Bill in Marathi. A Parliamentary Secretary spoke in Gujarathi and another member began to put questions in Kannada. All these happened because Bombay happens to be a multi-lingual province. If separate provinces had been formed on the basis of language, such absurdities would not have happened at all. It is better if these provinces are separated on the basis of language. Late Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastry, while speaking in the Indian Legislative Council on 16th February 1918, declared that "the idea of a compact area with a homogeneous population dwelling in it is certainly the most propitious condition that we can imagine for the success of Representative Government." A province must be designed in such a way as to enable the people and the Government of that province to transact and discuss the public business in a language which all the Legislators can speak with ease and which the electors can understand properly. In short the hope of a democratic Government lies in the language of the people.

The unhappy feature of the Bill is that it is not so exhaustive as to include the other undisputed Kannada-speaking areas, such as the taluk of Madakasira in Ananthapur District and the taluk of Kollegal in Coimbatore District, South Canara and so on. The Indian National Congress made many promises in this respect, but these promises have not been fulfilled so far. The Congress Working Committee seems to have passed a resolution that while forming the Andhra Province, the question of the formation of Karnataka province would also be considered. Almost all the leaders shouted from the house tops that they stand for linguistic provinces.

These resolutions and speeches have been completely ignored by the Central Government. This will leave a bad impression in the minds of the public that because Andhra people agitated, Andhra Province was created and because Kannadigas were silent and peaceful, their case was overlooked. To put it in other words, any achievement is possible only by means of agitation and direct action. Also the public will lose confidence in the leadership of those people who say something to-day and do something else tomorrow. When such an impression is left in the minds of the public, it is always dangerous to democracy. In 1916 an insertion was made in Congress Election manifesto to this effect: "The Congress has stood for full opportunities for the people as a whole to grow and develop according to their own wishes and genius. It has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger framework" and it has stated that "for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted as far as possible on a linguistic and cultural basis." Even in the year 1951, in the election manifesto, an insertion was made to that effect. I do not want to take the time of the House in quoting it. Similar resolutions were passed by the Mysore Congress Working Committee and the A.M.C.C. at Birur Session affirming the policy regarding the formation of linguistic provinces. Now the Congress Governments argue that they have not committed to the formation of linguistic provinces. Even if they have committed, times have changed so as not to implement it. Language is not the only criterion. These replies and promises of the Congress brings to my memory one story. Once a very brilliant person was removed to a lunatic asylum because of mental derangement for reasons unknown. The Doctor approached him for diagnosis. He said: "Hallo, Mr. Jonathan! what is your name?" He replied; "Ha, ha, you don't know? My name is King George." Then the Doctor went away. He came again next morning. Then he asked: "Hallo Mr. Jonathan, what is your name?" "Ha! ha! you don't know? I am Hitler." The doctor asked him; "Please excuse me if I interrupt you for a moment. Yesterday you said your name is King George, and to-day you say you are Hitler. How do you

explain it?" "Ah, ah, that was by a different mother" said Jonathan. So also the promises of the Congress seem to be by different mothers of yesterday and today. One of the important objections raised by one of my Hon'ble friends is that by creating linguistic provinces, it will lead to provincial rivalry and bitterness and this will subvert the very foundation and solidarity of the nation. Sir, there is no wisdom in this argument. The creation of linguistic provinces will in fact eliminate provincial rivalry and bitterness. It is common knowledge that when people speaking different languages happen to be grouped together within one Province, there exist rivalry and bitterness Take, for example, Bombay where different sub-nationalities are grouped together within one province. There is bitterness between Gujarathi and Maharashtriyans on the one hand and there is bitterness between the Maharrastriyans and Kannadigas on the other. It is because these sub-nationalities have been grouped within one province. Take, for example, Madras. There is bitterness between Andhras and Tamilians which has assumed greater proportion today. Therefore the existence of multi-lingual province is the sole cause for rivalry and bitterness between the various sub-nationalities and separation of these sub-nationalities and allowing themselves to form into separate units of the federation will put an end to all kinds of rivalries. For example, after Orissa was separated, the rivalry that existed between the Oriyas and Andhras practically ceased to exist; again there is no rivalry between Maharastriyans and Andhras, though they are neighbours, because they happen to remain in separate provinces. In Hyderabad different sub-nationalities are grouped together in one province. When they separate themselves, these rivalries cease to exist. Another argument advanced while opposing this Bill by my Hon'ble friend who is not here was that the formation of linguistic provinces will revive and inflame provincial loyalties so that it will consume and destroy nascent feeling of national loyalties. The acceptance of the principle of linguistic provinces would lead to balkanisation and distintegration of the country. I think this argument is almost an ill-conceived slogan blown into political arena by ameture and aspiring politicians in an atmosphere of despair and dissatisfaction. They think they may sink into political insignificance if larger Mysore or Karnataka is going to be formed. Of course. Indian Nation is full of sub-nationalities, each having a well developed language of its own, but that would not in any way impair the national solidarity. Because there is sub-stratum of common history, common tradition and common culturalties which have developed among the Indians a strong consciousness of being one people belonging to one Nation. All of us feel that we are children of India worshipping Mother India. That is the pride of India, in spite of various nationalities, there is common culture and common tradition and that has bound the people together in order to develop a sense of oneness and a feeling of brotherhood. These various sub-nationalities in India may not seek to break away from one another.

In short, in the comprehensive nationhood of India which we are building the individualities like the Bengalee, the Tamil, the Andhra, the Punjabi, the Maratha, the Gujarathi and the Kannadiga should find a proper place as District groups so that they may order their own affairs according to their own genius and aspirations as in the case of Welsh, Scotch and English in Great Britain and as the French and British in Canada. The existence of these various sub-nationalities which are common in other federations has never subverted national solidarity. Take for example the Swiss Federation where there are Germans, Italians and the French, each of them occupying distinct regions. In the Soviet Union the units of the federation are based on linguistic, ethnic and cultural affinity. Still they were able to fight the Second World War successfully.

It has been argued by some that Bellary is a deficit area, and that

(SRI M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.)

Mysore is industrially developed area and by allowing other people to join us, it will be a financial burden on us. But as the Hon'ble Chief Minister said, the Government should not act as a commercial concern looking into the profit and loss account. A patriotism which sees loss in forming greater homogeneous units is like a 'parish pump' order, parish and pump both enlarged by a few diameter. Even in olden days when there was expansion of territory either by conquest or discovery the immediate balancing of loss or profit seldom dictated the policy of the Government. But looking into the economic inequality between Bellary and Mysore I must say, it is not so immense. If you take the economic aspect into consideration, Bellary is rich in mineral resources such as iron mines, manganese ores, copper mines and gold mines. It has been estimated by certain experts that the production of iron, by establishing an Iron and Steel Factory in Bellary, would be about one million tons per annum which is almost equal to the total production of India. So far as irrigation work is concerned, there are already 50,000 acres of land under wet cultivation under the Raya and Basavanna canals and in addition, under the lower channel which is now completed about 90,000 acres will come under wet cultivation. When the high level channel is going to be completed about 1,50,000 acres of land will come under wet cultivation. All these lands are mostly in Kannada speaking regions. So far as cotton is concerned, they produce three times that of Mysore State. Groundnut is another important commercial crop and its production is equal to that of Mysore State. Regarding millets, it is a surplus area.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldurg).—Is it for the whole of Bellary District or for 7 taluks of that District only ?

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—It is only for 7 taluks of Bellary. Regarding the question of Boundary Commission, I would like to say only a few words. Various Committees have been appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a resolution so far as that is concerned.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—Yes, all the committees have unequivocally declared that the entire Bellary District is a Kannada speaking territory. In the year 1934 when Sri Pattabhi Sitaramiah submitted a memorandum on behalf of Karnataka Province to Lord Willingdon, it was stated therein that the District of Bellary is a Kannada speaking territory. In a linguistic map which was drawn by the Government of Madras and submitted to Justice Wanchoo by the Leaders of Andhra, it has been clearly marked that the District of Bellary is purely a Kannada speaking area. As per the Kelkar Award the District of Bellary was brought under the jurisdiction of Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. The Partition Committee, 1949, which consisted of important Andhra and Tamil leaders and had not Kannada representatives opined that Bellary District belonged to Karnataka. In the year 1933, the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee wanted to shift their office to Bellary. It was objected to by the A. I. C. C. They said that the Bellary District came within the jurisdiction of the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. So the other three taluks of the District of Bellary which is a Kannada-speaking area and all other undisputed Kannada-speaking regions found in the Madras State should be added on to Mysore immediately without waiting for the formation of the Boundary Commission, which if formed will delay the matter.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the magnanimity and hospitality of the people of Mysore has attracted the admiration of other States and in conformity with that tradition I extend my invitation to the people of Bellary to join us and thus help us in the task of forming greater Mysore or Karnataka by whichever name it is called.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet at 10-45 A.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Eighteen Minutes past Ten of the Clock and reassembled at Forty-five Minutes past Ten af the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli—Gudibanda)—It is such an important Bill with which we have to deal, that it may be taken up on Monday also. We will have to express our views on this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why I am giving a chance to Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—He may give his opinion, but can he give my opinion ? I request you to give me a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can speak on the Bill itself.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—I was the person who moved a resolution last time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You were pleased to withdraw that.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—I withdrew it on constitutional point.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—I welcome the Andhra State Bill, 1953. This Bill provides for the formation of the Andhra State. This also provides for increasing the area of the State of Mysore and diminishing the area of the State of Madras and for matters connected therewith. The formation of any Province after the achievement of independence is a logical implementation of political independence. In the year 1921, the Indian National Congress in its annual conference passed a resolution for the formation of linguistic provinces for its own organisational functions. During every annual conference afterwards resolutions connected with the formation of linguistic provinces were passed and the Indian National Congress promised to take up this question after the achievement of independence. But after the advent of freedom in the year 1947 this question assumed a very great importance just because people speaking certain languages wanted to have their own ambitions fulfilled. The Prime Minister made a statement in the House of the People on 19th December 1952 to establish an Andhra State and he promised that the question of the formation of other States would be considered after the formation of the Andhra State. He also promised that a Boundary Commission would be set up in order to go into the question of formation of other States not only on the basis of language but also on other basis like economic stability and other considerations. He appointed Justice Wanchoo to give a report on financial and other implications. Justice Wanchoo, who is the Chief Justice of Rajasthan, came to Madras, interviewed, many leaders of Political Parties and also paid visits to many cities and towns in Andhra Desa. He gave a very brief report on 7th February 1953. With regard to the Bellary District, he stated that the whole district should be kept intact. Just because the question of formation of Karnataka Province or any other province was not in the terms of reference, he did not want to give a decision as regards the District of Bellary. But anyhow he stated that in view of the culture and historical background and other considerations, the whole district should be kept intact and made a recommendation to the effect that till the formation of Karnataka Province, this district should form part of Andhra State temporarily.

The Prime Minister announced on 25th March 1953 in the Parliament that six taluks of Bellary should go to Mysore State and three taluks to Andhra State and as regards the Bellary taluk, the decision was not taken. On 21st April 1953, he appointed Justice Misra, Chief Justice of Hyderabad, to enquire into the question and give a report about the Bellary taluk. Justice Misra, as you are aware, toured the whole taluk of Bellary ; he came to Bangalore; he interviewed many important political leaders and gave a report on 18th May 1953. Copies of the report have been distributed to Hon'ble Members of this House. He recommended that the Bellary taluk should be included in Mysore State. On this recommendation our Prime Minister made a statement—on

(Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.)

the unanimous decision of the Cabinet also,—that Bellary taluk should be included in the Mysore State. Hence this Andhra State Bill, 1953, has been placed before us for our views.

Before I actually go into the Bill itself, I would just bring to the notice of Hon'ble Members the provision regarding the formation of new States, alterations of areas, boundaries or names of existing States as given in article 3 of part I of the Constitution of India.

"3. Parliament may by law—

(*a*) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State;

(*b*) increase the area of any State;

(*c*) diminish the area of any State;

(*d*) alter the boundaries of any State;

(*e*) alter the name of any State:

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State or States specified in Part A or B of the First Schedule or the name or names of any such State or States, the views of the Legislature of the State or as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions thereof have been ascertained by the President."

I am laying stress on the words "the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States......". The views of the Legislatures of Madras and also Mysore in the case of this Bill will have to be ascertained before any decision is taken by the Parliament. You all know the views are recommendatory. It is the Parliament that is the supreme authority that may accept or may not accept our views or the recommendations made by us. Still it is our duty to give our views and see that our views are respected also.

I come to Section 4 of the Bill. I will only stress upon certain sections which are connected with our State itself and I do not want to lay stress on other Sections connected with the Andhra Province.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—On a point of order, Sir. May I know whether the debate is proceeding on the first motion that has been put down on the order paper?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I was about to inform Sri R. Anantaraman that he need not go on discussing clause by clause. It is on general principles that the debate still continues and when the Bill is taken into consideration clause by clause he can refer to these matters.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—I am not referring to the whole Bill. I only quote one or two sections. Section 4 of this Bill says:

"As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Mysore, the territory which immediately before that day was comprised in taluks of Bellary District other than, Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg in the State of Madras, and the said territory shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of Madras.

(1) without prejudice to the power of the State Government to alter hereafter, the extent and boundaries of districts, the transferred territory shall form a separate district to be known as Bellary District."

According to Section 4 of the Bill, seven taluks will be included in the Mysore State, the other three taluks will be included in the Andhra State. You know Sir, that there is some sort of agitation going on regarding the inclusion of Bellary taluk in Mysore. When there is an award given by one of the eminent Chief Justices—Justice Misra, who after a good deal of

time, after hearing so many leaders, and also after taking statistics, etc., has given an award that this part of Bellary District should be included in Mysore I do not see the reason why there should be any agitation again over the same subject because you are aware, Sir, that any award given by a Judge has got certain sanctity about it. If the award is not accepted either by the Parliament or any other body or if the award is reversed, where is the sanctity for any such award ? Hereafter there will be no question of appointing any Judge or any independent impartial gentleman to give award on certain disputes that arise in States. So, it is better we respect the award and it is not reversed at all in the interests of justice. I know our Andhra friends are great. They have participated in the political freedom of our country and have made sacrifice. It is due to their sacrifice they get a State of their own so early. If these friends of ours agitate over a small matter like Bellary taluk, what would be the future of other linguistic provinces ? It is better that they should be broad-minded in such small matters and when such small disputes arise, it is better that the disputed matter is referred to an impartial Judge and a dicision is taken and is obeyed instead of contending that the award is not correct, etc. So I make an appeal to our Andhra friends not to agitate over this small matter. In fact, they have helped a good deal in the achievement of our freedom.

11 A.M.

I hope this will not be made much of hereafter. As regards the other three taluks, our Prime Minister has made a statement. No doubt, it is an admitted fact that in these three taluks, there are a large number of Kannada-speaking people and also there are Telugu-speaking people. Our Prime Minister was kind enough to make a statement that a Boundary Commission will be appointed and such matters will be left to that Boundary Commission. It may be a Judge or an impartial tribunal that may be appointed. The decision of such a tribunal will have to be respected. This tribunal will go into these small questions. I am sure that most of the three taluks will come into the Bellary District. I know that there are a number of Telugu-speaking people in the three taluks. If the Andhra friends are not willing to join the Bellary District, the Boundary Commission will have to divide those taluks also. Instead of making some agitation, it is better we refer the matter to the Boundary Commission as advised by our Prime Minister. It is better we wait for some time more. I am sure that the Commission that would be set up in the future will attend to this question and see that this matter also will be settled amicably. There are other documentary evidences to show, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, that the whole district including those three taluks will have to be added to the Mysore State along with the other seven taluks. For example, I would like to mention the Kelkar Award. You are all aware that the award was given in 1921 when a dispute arose as regards the formation of provinces on linguistic basis for organisational functions. Then, the Andhras claimed that the whole of Bellary taluk should be included in the Andhra province. Then Kelkar was appointed to go into the question. He gave an award that it should not be included in Andhra. The Partition Commission in 1947, consisting of eminent Andhra leaders opined that the whole district should be included in Karnataka. Justice Wanchoo also has stated that the whole district must be kept intact. In fact, if at all it is going to be included, Bellary District must be included in Karnataka and not in Andhra. There is the J. V. P Report. This district particularly forms a part of Karnataka. The Leader of the Opposition referred to in his speech to the Partition Commission, in which eminent Andhra Leaders like Sri Kaleswar Rao, Sri Suryanarayana Rao and others have said that this should form part and parcel of Karnataka. The documentary evidence of the admission of Andhra leaders have their own probative value. These statements were made at a time when there was no dispute. All of them have admitted

(Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.)

that this district formed a part of Karnataka. Why should they now go back against their opinions and statements and say that it does not form part of Karnataka? Our leaders should not change their opinions; important opinions and statements that concern the whole State—now and then.

I went through the Bill. As regards representation to the Upper House, I find that the representatives of Chitaldrug District will represent Bellary District also. I do not know why the present representatives from Bellary District are not included in the Upper House of our State itself. As regards the Andhra Province, our Prime Minister has taken a definite stand that it should have only one Chamber and not the Upper House. But in Mysore, we have two Chambers, the Upper and the Lower House. When there is a representative from that district, how is it his name is not included in the list of members of our Upper House? It is but fair that that particular representative should be given a place in the Upper House of Mysore. Of course we are going to get five reprsentatives to sit in the Assembly and one...... .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, these are matters of detail. May I suggest that the Hon'ble Member may discuss these points at the consideration stage, when clause by clause will be taken up?

Sri R ANANTARAMAN.—I do not want to speak further on this Bill, because we will have another opportunity to speak when it will be taken up clause by clause. One more important suggestion I wish to make is as regards the Tungabhadra Project. I have also sent a resolution to this august House that the maintenance, etc., of this dam located in Hospet, should be the concern of our State itself. Some people are talking that a Board should be set up to look after the whole project. It may be a good idea. But, will it not be better that the management and maintenance work is left over to our State? There may be an apprehension in the minds of our Andhra friends that they will not be benefited by this arrangement. Supposing we come to a certain agreement with them regarding the sharing of water, will not our State respect the agreement? You are aware that with regard to the Cauvery Waters, there is a certain agreement and that agreement is even now strictly adhered to. These are all inter-State agreements. I think it is better that Tungabhadra Project is left to the management of Mysore State itself. As regords compensation .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have sent a resolution. You can speak on that occasion.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—As regards compensation, you are aware that the new Andhra Province is going to get a compensation, to build up its Capital, from the Centre. Many of our friends have spoken that Bellary District is a deficit area. If that is the case, why not the Centre pay a portion of the compensation to Mysore State also? It is better we also make a representation to the Centre that a share in the compensation should be given when compensation is given to the other State. Though not much, some adequate amount may be given to Mysore, just to see that some amenities are given to the people of the seven taluks of Bellary District.

I do not wish to say much except to welcome our brethren from the seven taluks of Bellary. We, all of us unanimously welcome and I hope that we will not differ in that welcoming. As regards the new Province, let us wish them good luck and prosperity, etc. Some of our friends, now and then, say that formation of a linguistic province may lead to a lot of provinciality. I do not think in that manner. Don't you think that Andhra friends are also nationalistic? As regards the formation of a State, they may be provincial, but as regards the interests of our country, I may tell you that they will be second to none in showing their patriotism. They have contributed much and have also sacrificed much to gain the freedom of our country. Let us not say that this sort of formation of linguistic provinces will lead to provincialism. As regards the other States—certain portions in the residuary State of Madras and also

Bombay—as our Chief Minister has been saying, if and when those friends are willing to come and join us, we will have no objection. Mysore is always ready to welcome any contiguous part of the residuary parts of Madras and Bombay to come and join us. I hope we will join together in the formation of a Karnataka Province. Whether you call it Greater Mysore or Karnataka province, it is the same. I do not want to say much except welcoming this Bill—the Andhra Bill.

(*Many Hon'ble Members rose*).

*Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—May I make a suggestion to help the Chair, Sir?
ಈ ಆಂಧ್ರರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಮೂರು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಅನಂತರಾಮನ್‌ರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವೊಂದು ನಿರ್ದೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಏನೊಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ 'consideration' ಮೋಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ clause by clause debate ನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಮುಖ್ಯ ತತ್ವಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು clause by clause ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸುವಾಗಲೇ ಈ clause by clause ನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನೂ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ clause by clause ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ clause by clause ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಆಗಲೆ ಎರಡಾವರ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಘಟ್ಟ 'introduction of the Bill.' ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಇದಾದನಂತರ, 'Bill will be taken for consideration.' ಆಗ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬಹುದು. ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ 'clause by clause' ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

(Sri Rama Rao and some other Members rose).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I see there are nearly a dozen Members who still want to speak. No time-limit was fixed on the first day for speeches when the Bill was taken into consideration. I am prepared to hear what the House wants me to do in the circumstances.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Time has to be extended.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House may indicate whether the general debate relating to the first part of the Bill should continue to-day and on Monday also or whether the general debate may be closed to-day. When the second part of the Bill is taken into consideration, Members will be at liberty to speak about the Bill. I am prepared to carry out whatever the Members desire me to do.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I submit that taking into consideration the importance of the Bill, there is need to extend the time allotted by at least two or three days. It is true we had four days at our disposal. The first day was taken up for the introduction of the Bill by the Chief Minister. The second day was taken away by Government Business and thirdly the duration of meetings has been curtailed; since we are meeting in the mornings, as against five hours we are meeting only for four hours. The time allotted is very inadequate and we have to do full justice to the Bill. If we take into consideration the time taken in the other House and in other place, the Legislative Council has taken five days. I feel that the time should be extended by at least another two days. So the general debate may continue on next Monday and Tuesday also if there are more Members. Then for consideration of clauses, we need a good bit of the time. Every clause is important:

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

a number of amendments have been tabled and we have to do full justice. Practically we have to meet for this purpose the whole of next week and beyond that. The Members should not be handicapped for want of time; as much time as is needed should be given and I am sure the Leader of the House will accommodate us taking into consideration the importance of the Bill.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I have to add one point to what has been said by Sri J. Mohamed Imam. That is, very few Andhra Members are in the Legislative......

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—On a point of order. There are no Andhra Members here, but they are Mysore Members.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—There are very few Members who espouse the cause of Andhra and all of them should be given a chance to speak on this important and vital Bill.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I certainly want that the provisions of the Bill should be discussed in detail and in sufficient measure. But how to do it is the question. Now, Sir, some of us find it very difficult to distinguish, for purposes of debate, the stage of introduction and the stage of consideration. We mix up the speeches that we have to make on these two occasions. Therefore, I suggest that the introduction stage may be concluded as soon as possible so that, at the consideration stage, Members will be free to express their opinion in detail. We have already discussed the introduction motion sufficiently long. Therefore, Sir, if it is your wish that this day must be devoted wholly for the introduction stage, it would be done and I will reply immediately after the House meets the next day and then the consideration motion will be passed and at the stage of consideration, other Hon'ble Members who wish to speak will certainly have an opportunity and it would not be right, Sir, to go on altering the programme fixed. This is the third time we are attempting to alter it; the programme fixed must stand in the interest of economy as well as in accordance with the understanding we have already arrived at.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We are not responsible for the change of programme. I think it is the Government that is responsible. They took away one day, yesterday.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—The days that have been allotted to Andhra Bill may be adhered to.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—We are certainly responsible for enabling the Government to proceed with the business that is set before this House. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that there is no responsibility on us. For the time spent yesterday on other matters, the responsibility rests with us because that is also official business.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—The number of days allotted for this bill will stand.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—With regard to the Andhra State Bill, I should suggest that the debate on the first motion has proceeded sufficiently and if there are other Hon'ble Members desirous of making observations on the first motion, they may be allowed to make today and the next day may be allotted for debate on the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—One hour is not sufficient today. That seems to be the opinion of the House.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I was only suggesting that the consideration of the Bill, if it is possible to make that motion on the next day set apart for the debate on this Bill, would be helpful because, if I may say so, with great respect, the general set up of the whole Bill as well as the important features of the Bill apart from what is contained in the clauses would be a matter for, I expect, very instructive debate and a very helpful debate so far as the Government are concerned in this matter, because it deals with a very important issue. Therefore, I suggest that it should be possible for the Government to make the consideration motion on the next day set apart for the business and the debate on the introduction motion may be concluded to-day.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is not that I want to say anything against the wishes of the Members. It is not that everyone is expected to speak. Party system of Government presup-

poses that Members speak for the party they represent. If every one is desirous of speaking, that would not be in consonance with the party system of Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The party must see to that, not the Speaker.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—In case of Bills in respect of which the party decides, there will be freedom of discussion. Members are allowed to express any view they want in such cases and I therefore think that some latitude has to be shown.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—This is not a party issue. I think we are not fighting this on party principles.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there no agreement ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—There is no question of agreement. Four days have been allotted for this Bill and those days will be adhered to. As Sri Rama Rao has suggested, the introduction stage has to conclude today and next day we have to take up the consideration motion. We cannot go on indefinitely. Even on the procedure, we have agreement. Every day we cannot go on re- opening the question.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I seek one clarification from the Chair. The general sense of the House is that it hould be extended and they must be given an opportunity. The Government do not want to give as much scope as possible for the debate. When the general sense of the House is to extend the time for debate, the Government's idea is to curtail the liberty and freedom of the Members of the House.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is far better he avoids such words.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Chief Minister categorically and specifically states that four days have been allotted for the debate and we must stick up to it. We cannot put up with such mandate. You know, all the Members of the House are anxious to take part in the debate and express their wishes ; as against this wish of the House, if the Government want to stick to the programme, what is the procedure to be adopted, I want to know. Are you going to be guided by the general sense of the House or what the Leader of the House says ? This is a matter which affects very much the freedom and privileges of the House. While fixing the business of this House, I think the sense of the House must be taken. The Government say one day is enough or one hour is enough. Are we to put up with this ? In the Upper House where there are 40 Members, they have taken nearly 6 days.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Why do you speak incorrectly ?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Whatever it may be. This is the House whose opinion will be taken into consideration ! This is the courtesy that is shown to the Members of the House by the Chief Minister !

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know from the Leader of the House, as to how many days were allotted for the discussion of this Bill in the Upper House ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Introduction stage is over. Now, we are in the consideration motion stage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—For a House consisting of 40 Hon'ble Members, six days are allotted ; for 100 Members four days are allotted ; that is their point. And unfortunately, I use the word 'unfortunately, the initial mistake was that no time-limit was fixed. The Leader of the House himself suggested and agreed and he gave his consent, free consent, for no time-limit being fixed. We will go on till 12-30 P.M., and then take the sense of the House. Shall we fix a time-limit now for speeches ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—We will leave it to your good sense.

11-30 A.M.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—The necessity of redistribution of States throughout India, especially so in South India, is existing from a long time. Of course, there are very few methods of redistribution. I think the districts should be included on the historical basis, or administrative and economic basis, or geographical, linguistic and cultural basis. Now fortunately or unfortunately, we have accepted and every leader and every party seems to have accepted the linguistic basis for the redistribution of States.

(Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.)

The Bill is welcome though it goes only half-way to meet the legitimate national aspirations of the Andhra people to be united in Vishalandhra and to devise a democratic and satisfactory method of settling all disputes incidental to the formation of the new State.

The heroic people of Andhra who waged a consistent struggle for a National State and made great sacrifices in that behalf culminating in the supreme sacrifice of Sri Potti Sreeramulu and wrested from unwilling hands the right to form themselves into an Andhra State, though at present in a truncated form, will receive the hearty congratulations and warm greetings of all the freedom loving people in the country. The Andhra State to be formed on the 1st of October 1953 would be the first State to be formed in our country on the basis of the linguistic and cultural homogeneity of its people. But the majority of the Telugu-speaking people will remain outside the new Andhra State scattered in the State of Orissa, Hyderabad and Mysore—and it cannot be long before they come together in Vishalandhra. The certainty of the coming into being of the Andhra State has given an impetus, to the growing national consciousness of the Telugu-speaking people even in areas which were hitherto considered politically backward. No power on earth can stop the Andhra people from realising their natural and democratic aspiration to be united in Vishalandhra and grow to their full stature in fraternal co-operation with the sister peoples and the nationalities in the country. Any attempt to defeat the realisation of this aspiration of the Andhra people would be deplorable, undemocratic and chauvinistic and is doomed to fail.

The Bill is but the beginning of a new era, the era of National States based on the linguistic and cultural homogeneity of its people working in fraternal co-operation with each other in all matters of common interest. In the fitness of things, the Bill should be amended so as to give to the people of Andhra what is due to them and provide an opportunity for all the Andhras to be united in their National State of Vishalandhra.

The attitude of the Mysore administration in treating the question of linguistic redistribution as question of either addition of territory to Mysore or loss of territory to Mysore has helped the development of an unhealthy, undemocratic and chauvinistic attitude towards the problem of nationalities. It has to be borne in mind that Mysore (along with the other feudal states in India) was the arbitrary creation of the Imperialists for their own convenience. It is not a State which has evolved into an entity on the basis of the linguistic and cultural homogeneity of its people. The myth of Mysore being the abstract object of the loyalty of people has no substance and is only a feudal bogey.

The very reason why the Imperialists divided the country in the manner they did was to create and foster mutual jealousies and hatred among the people of different languages, castes and communities and to see that the people remain in a perpetual state of strife and backwardness so that their imperialist exploitation could be carried on without having to face the united opposition of the people and to enable the feudal order of society to maintain itself as the main prop of imperialism on the basis of the ignorance, backwardness and internal strife of thepeople.

It has to be realised therefore that we as free people have first to undo the mischief wrought by the imperialist masters and their supporters and re-align ourselves into National States so that the various nationalities comprised in our great country might, on the basis of their own essential unity of language and of culture, develop the richness of their own lives, and co-operate with each other in building a glorious future for all the working people in the country.

The question of the national aspiration of the Kannada people for a National State is necessarily linked up with the question of the future of the Telugu-speaking people in Mysore inhabiting the area contiguous with

Andhra. No people who dominate over another can for long be free by themselves. Whatever be the intention of either the Mysore administration or of the Kannada people, the mass of the Andhra people in Mysore existing as a neglected adjunct of Mysore can never develop into an enlightened people capable of making their maximum contribution to the growing richness of their language and culture, nor will enlightenment ever reach the masses of people so as to enable them to make any real advancement towards a happy future. It is therefore most unfortunate, short-sighted and undemocratic for the Mysore administration or Kannada people to oppose the natural aspiration of the Telugu people of Mysore to join Vishalandhra. It is futile in the last analysis to oppose it. In terms of the basic interests of the common people and in terms of their cultural and economic advancement, the Telugu people in Mysore could rise to their fullest stature only when they become an integral part of Vishalandhra.

The people of Mysore and Administration in Mysore should have a realistic and a scientific approach to the linguistic question and foster the genuine democratic movement growing all over the country for its re-distribution on the basis of the linguistic and cultural homogeneity of its people. The greatest obstacle in the way of linguistic re-distribution and main pillars of feudalism striving to retard the growing unity and national consciousness of the people are the States of Hyderabad, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. The disintegration of these creatures of imperialism is now inevitable.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are reading your speech. I cannot allow it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—(Minister for Home and Industries).—It is a very good piece of manuscript eloquence.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Besides it is lengthy. You have not read even half of it. This will not be allowed.

Sri B.V. NARAYANA REDDY.—Only three minutes more.

We therefore should now realise that the people of Mysore have a responsibility to play a progressive role, namely, the movement for linguistic States. The Kannadigas in Mysore and outside Mysore have yet to fight for the Kannada State to which the vested interests are opposed for their own reasons and in the interests of their own security. While in the midst of a fight for their own freedom and for their national State, the Kannadigas should not for a moment think of subjugating another people who are as anxious as themselves to realise their aspiration for a National State of their own.

It has to be borne in mind that real peace and progress can be attained only on the basis of the unity and the cultural development of the various nationalities. The vested interests in their anxiety to preserve the present Imperialist division of the country are raising the bogey of national unity and security as an argument to shelve the question of Linguistic States. The people must expose the real game of these false defenders of the unity of the country and defeat their object of keeping the people divided and backward and remain helpless victims of their exploitation and misrule.

The way in which the communal and feudal reaction in Mysore and outside Mysore is using the issue of Linguistic States is most deplorable. The sooner the people realise the inner motive of these cliques, the better for the people. The contradictions within the ruling party have led to great confusion in the movement of the people for the Linguistic States. The attitude of these cliques towards this basic question is purely opportunist and dictated by exigencies of their self-interest. Claims which are purely chauvinistic and which were only got up to satisfy the territorial ambitions of a group or a clique, which are otherwise unpatriotic and undemocratic are put forth in various garbs. These tendencies will have to be exposed in time and the unity of the people on the basis of their essential interests will have to be built up.

All disputes regarding the disputed boundaries and areas about which there may be a genuine dispute will have to

(Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.)

be settled in a democratic manner either by a plebiscite or by a duly constituted Boundary Commission. To foster the development of mutual bickering and hatred over such disputes would only be the method of the Imperislists which they always used to divide and discredit the people so that they might remain as the perpetual and wise arbitors of the destinies of the people. It is therefore necessary that a Boundary Commission is constituted to go into the question of all such disputed matters including the question of Bellary Taluks now included in Mysore and also about the other taluks of Bellary District now included in Andhra.

The Mysore Administration should no longer sit on the fence. It must unequivocally declare its attitude towards the democratic movement for the redistribution of the country into its component nationalities and the formation of National States on the basis of the linguistic and cultural homogeneity of its people.

Speaking in regard to the Tungabhadra Project, I would humbly suggest that a Board............

MR. SPEAKER.—There is a resolution regarding that. You may speak on that occasion.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—For the Tungabhadra Project I would suggest that a joint board should be formed representing Andhra, Hyderabad and Mysore with a representative of the Central Government as its Chairman.

I would once again remind my friends about the principle of linguistic provinces; they must also accept that all contiguant parts of Telugu speaking people in Mysore State should go to Vishala Andhra.

MR. SPEAKER.—I think, on this occasion, a ruling is necessary for future guidance. A member is not permitted to read his speech except a Minister who wants to make an important statement. But he may refresh his memory by reference to notes. I hope the House will kindly bear this in mind while making speeches in future.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತಾ, ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಪುಲವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಭಾಷಣಮಾಡಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಲಾಭನಷ್ಟದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬಾರದೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಜವಾಬು ಕೊಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ನಷ್ಟ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವುದೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಲಾಭನಷ್ಟದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬಾರದು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಆಂಧ್ರಪ್ರಾಂತ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು, ಎಂದರೆ, ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಜನರಿರುವ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇವು ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಈ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದ್ದು, ಖರ್ಚು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದೇ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಜಲಾಶಯವಿದೆ; ಈ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ನಮಗೂ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ನೀರಾವರಿಯಾಗುವುದು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮದರಾಸು ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಇದು ರೀಜನಲ್ ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ರಾಯಲಸೀಮೆ ಪಾಲಿಟೆಕ್ನಿಕ್, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು 200 ಬೆಡ್ಸ್ ಇರುವ ಟ್ಯೂಬರ್‌ಕುಲೋಸಿಸ್ ಸ್ಯಾನಿಟೋರಿಯಂ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಫಾರಂಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಇವೆ, ಹಗರಿ ಫಾರಂ, ಸಿರಿಗುಪ್ಪ ಫಾರಂ ಇವೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರುವಾಗ ಇದರಿಂದ ನಷ್ಟವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಾರದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸಂಡೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣ ಮತ್ತು ಮ್ಯಾಂಗನೀಸ್ ಅದುರು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟಿದೆ. 1946—47ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ ಎ. ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮೊದಲಿಯಾರ್‌ರವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ದಿವಾನರಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಆಗಿನ ಸಂಡೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣ ಮತ್ತು ಮ್ಯಾಂಗನೀಸ್ ಅದುರು ತೆಗೆದು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು

ಕೂಡ ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆಗ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆ ಕೂಡ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ನಾವು ಕೊಡುವ ಕೆಲವು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟೆವು, ಆಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದರಿಂದ ನಿಂತುಹೋಯಿತು. ಈಗ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶವೂ ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರಿ, ಖನಿಜಸಂಪತ್ತು ದೊರೆಯುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಈ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮುಂದೆ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾಗಿ, ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಣಮಿಸುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ವೈದ್ಯಕೀಯ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ; ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ನಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ನಾನು ಲಾಭನಷ್ಟ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡಬಾರದು. ಇದು ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುವ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿವಾದಾಸ್ಪದವಾಗಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಏನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅದನ್ನು re-open ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಬಹಳ ನ್ಯಾಯಬಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ನೆರೆ ಪ್ರಾಂತವಾದ ಮದರಾಸು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಪುಲವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದು, ಪುನಃ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು re-open ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ನಿರಾಶೆಯ ಫಲವಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಾದ ವಿಧಾನಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದಲೂ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದೇ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿದೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಷಯ ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ, ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆಲೂರು, ಆದವಾನಿ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಯದುರ್ಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಮನವಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪುನಃ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬಾರದು. ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಬೇರೆಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವೇ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಚಿವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಾವಿನ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ undisputed Telugu area ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆಂಧ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಆರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಆಗ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿವಾದ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶವೇನು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದು, ಅದರ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾರವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿ, ಕಟ್ಟಕಡೆಗೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಆಖೈರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಮಾಡಿದರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಇವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಆ ಒಂದು ಅವಾರ್ಡನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಬಹಳ ಅಮೂಲ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವರದಿ. ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಇನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದಿರುವುದೇ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆದರೆ ನಾವಿನ್ನು ಈಗ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು, ಆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ 3 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ ಆಲೂರು, ಆದವಾನಿ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಯದುರ್ಗ ಇವಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೂ ಈಗ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳ ಜನರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿತೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅವೂ ಕೂಡ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಲು ನಮ್ಮಗಳಾರದೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಅಜಿಟೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವದಂತಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಒಂದು ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾರಾದರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳ ಧೋರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬಹಳ ನ್ಯಾಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯುವಂತಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಆ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಜನರು ಅವರೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಜಿಟೇಷನ್ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ—ಆಗ ಅವರೂ ಆಡಳಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಈ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳೂ ಸೇರುವುದು ಯುಕ್ತವೆಂದೂ, ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದೂ ತಿಳಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಜನರನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಇವರಂತೆಯೇ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರದೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಿಂದ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಜಿಟೇಷನ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.)

ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಸೆಟ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಲಯಬಿಲಿಟೀಸ್ (ಲೇಣಿದೇಣಿ) ಗಳ ಒಂದು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಈಗ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್, ಆಂಧ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು—ಈ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳವರೂ ಒಂದು ಒಡಂಬಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಹಳ ಹುಷಾರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಒಪ್ಪಂದದ ಕರಾರುಗಳಾಗುವಾಗ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ನಡೆದಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವಿಲೀನೀಕರಣವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ಐಟಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸಹ ಅದನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಆಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಮಗೂ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರಿಗೂ ನಡೆದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳಾದವೋ ಹಾಗೇ ಈಗಲೂ ಆಗಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾವು ಈ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಡೆಟ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಅಸೆಟ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಲಯಬಿಲಿಟೀಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ಆ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ವಿಶೇಷ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಿಸಿ, ಆ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ಖಚಿತವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲು ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನಾದರೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ, ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಬರುವಂಥ ಆಖೈರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಬಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನಿರುತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅನಂತರ ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಅಂತ್ಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದದ್ದೆಂದೂ ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಸ್ವಾಗತವನ್ನು ನೀಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ, ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವನಂಜೇಗೌಡ (ಮೈಸೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವ ವಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಕೆಲವು ಅಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಭಾಗಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಬರುವ ದಸೆಯಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಲು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ಆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಈಗ ದತ್ತವಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಜನರು ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಾಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಲು ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಸೇರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಜನರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರುವಂತಾಯಿತು. ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಆಸೆಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಲು ನಾನೀಗ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಜನರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗಲಿರುವ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಾಗದಿದ್ದ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರು ಸೇರಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡದೆ ಇದ್ದುದರಿಂದಲೂ, ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಸೇರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದಲೂ, ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರಲು ಆಸೆಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮೊಡನೆ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರೋಪಾದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಅವರನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ.

ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ವಿಶಾಲಗೊಳಿಸುವಾಗ ಎಡಬಲಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೈಚಾಚದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಒಂದು ಸುಯೋಗವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೇನೆ; ಆಡಳಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕು, ಅದರ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವೆಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕು, ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಒಂದು ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಯವಾದ ಲೆಖ್ಖಾಚಾರವಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಒಂದು ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ಮಿತಿಯಿರಬೇಕು. ದುಡ್ಡಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಮನೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ದೊಡ್ಡದಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೆ ಏನು ಸಾರ್ಥಕ? ಆ ಮನೆ ದಿನದಿನಕ್ಕೂ ಕುಸಿದು ಬಿದ್ದುಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ಸೋರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಂಚು ಹೊದಿಸಿ ಸರಿಮಾಡದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅಂಕಣ ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತಾಹೋದರೆ ಅದು ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲದ ಬದುಕು." ಈಗ ನಾವು ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಜಂಟಿಮನೆ, ಅವಳಿಜವಳಿ ಮನೆ, 12 ಕಂಬಗಳಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡಮನೆ, ಎಂದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾವು ವಾಸವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಇಡೀ ದೇಶವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಿಮಾಚಲದಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಕನ್ಯಾಕುಮಾರಿವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನೆಯೋಪಾದಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕನ್ನಡ, ತೆಲುಗು, ಆಂಧ್ರ, ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಕನ್ನಡ, ತೆಲುಗು, ಆಂಧ್ರ, ಉರ್ದು ಈ ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದೇ ದೇಶದ ಲಕ್ಷಣ.

12 NOON.

ದೇಶವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದೇ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ

ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ನಾಯಕರುಗಳಾಗಿ ಹೊರಟು ತಾವು ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೆ, ತಮಗೆ ತೋರಿದಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ಒಬ್ಬರು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ರೀತಿ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸಾಧುವಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಲೀಡರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಉನ್ಮತ್ತಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳ ಅಮಲು ಇಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಇವರುಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಕಡೆ ಚಾವಡಿ ಮುಂದೆ ದೇವರುಗಳ ಆವೇಶ ಬಂದು ತಮಟೆಯ ಶಬ್ದದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಣಿಯುತ್ತಾ, ಮನಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ನಾಯಕರುಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯದಿಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಲೇಸು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಇನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮೊಡನೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅವರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರೇ ನಿಜ. ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರಾದರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೂ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಸುಖವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿರಲೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದಲೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ತಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ, ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿಗೆ 20,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನೇ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುವಾಗ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕಡಮೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ಇನ್ನು ಆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳೂ ಬಂದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರನ್ನೂ ನಮ್ಮೊಡನೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ, ಅವಳಿ ಮನೆಯಾದರೂ ನಡುವೆ ಒಂದು ಗೋಡೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡೇ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರಯಾಗಿ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರಭಾರದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಆಸೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮರ್ರವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವದ ಮಾತನ್ನಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲೇಕೋ ಅವರೊಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹೊಳೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಬಗ್ಗಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗೋಣ ಎಂದವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಹೊಳೆ ಬರುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡೆದು ಒಂದು ಗೋಡೆಹಾಕಿ ಬೇರೆಕಡೆ ತಿರುಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಬರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾದ ಎಲ್ಲೆಕಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಅವರು ಅದರಾಚೆಯೇ ಇರಲಿ; ನಾವು ಈಚೆಯೇ ಇರೋಣ. ಇಷ್ಟುಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—In discussing the Andhra State Bill, 1953, it is my bounden duty to pay my humble homage to that great and noble patriot Sri Potti Sriramulu who sacrificed his life for the very cause. It is a day of rejoicing for Andhras, whether they live in the Andhra State that is going to come into existence, whether they live in Mysore, whether they live in Hyderabad, whether they live in Madhya Pradesh, whether they live in Orissa. It is a day of independence I should say, it is a day on which all Andhras should be proud to ake their place in their national home. When in 1947 the Independence dawned on India, every one of us felt we were independent and we rejoiced on that day. In the same way, the Andhras will feel glad on this appointed day, that is, on the First of October 1953 that they have come to their own State, their National State. The problem of linguistic provinces is a very important and vital problem. There are people who advocate that there should be redistribution of provinces on the basis of language. There are others who say just the opposite thing. It is admitted on all hands that the present distribution of States in India is not scientific one; it was done at the instance of the Britishers and by the Britishers for their own imperialistic ends. It is admitted that redistribution of provinces is necessary so that the provinces may work more homogeneously, more effectively. When such is the case, these things should not be decided in a hurry or they should not be decided at the point of a revolver. I agree that there should be redistribution of provinces on the basis of language. But the people living in different parts of India should at the earliest opportunity come to certain agreed formula. By mere agitation these things should not be decided. They should come to an understanding. But the difficulty about this is this: If the vital problems that are facing the people of India were solved first, these things would not have resulted in the passions that were aroused in certain parts of India. If the division was made after socialism had been established in India, so much of loss and profit business would not have been discussed by members of this Assembly or by members of any other Assembly. I was one of those who felt that the most important problem of the people, the problem of food, the solution of which depended on the fact that we should progress properly and well, should have been tackled before this problem of linguistic redistribution was taken. Today it is too late to lament upon what is already happening. The people have begun to think that it is not possible to live or to work in a Province

(Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

where the majority of the people speak one language and the others speak another language. When such is the case, it is but natural that this agitation for the distribution of provinces on the basis of language primarily should receive as much attention as it should. I never expected that this Andhra State Bill would come up before this Assembly for two reasons. On the 19th December 1952 the Prime Minister of India announced in the Parliament that the Andhra State would be formed out of undisputed areas. If that proposition or announcement had been adhered to, this problem would not have arisen here. The other day Sri Pattabhiraman echoed the feelings of Sri T. Prakasam that this should have been restricted to Madras and Madras alone, but now that these seven taluks have been proposed to be tacked on to Mysore, it has really created certain problems for Mysore also. These seven taluks have been proposed to be transferred to Mysore for two reasons (1) they said that these seven taluks were predominantly Kannada speaking areas, and (2) it was proposed by the Mysore Government in their Memorandum to Justice Misra, that administratively also it was necessary.

The Andhra State Bill has certain provisions. When we come to discuss the Bill clause by clause, I propose to make my contribution in that respect. But there are certain things which we should take note of. In this Bill, it has been very wisely and properly put that there will be no second chamber in Andhra. The same thing should have been applied to Mysore and Madras.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Why?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I will tell you why. When most of the important subjects have been transferred to the Centre, when Parliament is going to discuss those things and when minor matters have been left to State legislatures, I see no reason why second chambers should exist in States. Further, we know how these second chambers have been used for political purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That was discussed once already.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—The politics of Madras would have been different, Sir, but for the misuse of the powers invested in the Governor with regard to nominations to the......

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not relevant.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Also, Sir, it is a reflection on a sister Government and a sister Legislature.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I was striving to point out how this second chamber would be misused. That is all I wanted to say. There need be no regret on anybody's part.

In Mysore, there is no necessity for continuing this second chamber. At the earliest possible time, it deserves to be abolished. It ought to be scrapped. We know, Sir, how during this Session it has been difficult for the Ministers to cope up with the work. They were not able to be present either here or in the Upper Chamber with justice.........

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not relevant to the Bill.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—With regard to the seven taluks that are proposed to be transferred to Mysore State, during the question hour, some answers were elicited. When we are taking these seven taluks, we must accept to fulfil the commitments that we will have to perform in this respect. When we know exactly what the financial implication is, we will be in a position to find out a solution for that problem. We know that by transfer of these seven taluks to Mysore State, Mysore will have to incur an expenditure of about thirty lakhs of rupees annually. Further, when once these seven taluks are transferred to Mysore State, with what voice can we say that no further improvement can be made for Bellary? They will be citizens of Mysore and will have as much right to demand from Mysore Government the same sort of improvements as are being effected in other parts of Mysore. It is not only thirty lakhs we have to spend as is now understood, but we will have to spend another thirty lakhs. So we must be prepared to spend a sum of sixty lakhs of rupees on the

transferred territory for every year for another ten years. As has been pointed out by the Chief Minister during this motion before this House, we never wanted these seven taluks, but we are not obstructing them to come into Mysore State. It was at the decision of the Government of India that these seven taluks are going to be transferred to Mysore State. When such is the case .....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, let the Hon'ble Member not summarise my phraseology. It may be misconstrued in some quarters when he says that I never wanted Bellary to come into Mysore State. That is not quite correct.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—What I said was, the Chief Minister or the Government of Mysore did not agitate for the inclusion of this territory into Mysore State...

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is different from saying that I did not want them.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—We did not agitate for the seven taluks. It was done at the instance of the Government of India. I want to come to the rescue of the Government of Mysore in saying that it has been done at the instance of the Government of India and that it is their bounden duty to subsidise to the extent that the Mysore Government is going to suffer on account of the transfer of seven taluks. We have already three famine districts in Mysore.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose after a decade, Bellary becomes a paying district ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am not worried whether it is going to be a paying one or a deficit one for ever. My point is that the Government of India must subsidise for sometime to come so that the Government of Mysore may give adequate facilities to the people of Bellary and develop further. That was all my point of view when I said that the Government of India should come to the rescue of the Mysore Government with regard to this.

Out of these seven taluks, I know to some extent intimately, there are predominantly Telugu speaking people in certain areas. There are certain predominantly Telugu speaking areas in parts of Hospet, Kudligi and Sandur.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I suppose what he meant was personally predominant.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—It is my personal knowledge.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can give the percentage if you know it.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—In Kudligi taluk, in Gudekota firka, eighty per cent are Telugu speaking people.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Where did you get the figures ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I ask you to refer to the Census. It is my business to state it and it is your business to refute it after gathering information.

Regarding Bellary, much has been said about the Misra Report. Misra Report is a report and nothing more than that. It is after all the opinion of a particular person. I would have given some other report taking the basis of the Census. He need not have gone to Bellary. He need not have spent eight days to give such a report. When the very basis on which Justice Misra has used his report is disputed, how can we say that it is an award ? He did not agree to go to the villages even though a challenge was thrown that the people in interior villages should be consulted. He never went to these villages and he never verified.

1951 Census and 1931 Census were disputed by the Andhras. Another argument has been advanced that the Andhra leaders who participated in the Partition Committee conceded that this Bellary District was a Kannada District or that they did not take up the issue of Andhras in Bellary. I am perfectly in agreement with what has been said. But what exactly was the time and why did they take up that attitude ? They were anxious to have the Andhra State. They were disgusted with the exploitation of Andhras by Non-Andhras in Madras ; they were so anxious that they wanted that at the earliest possible time the Andhra State should come into being. Their anxiety was that they did not want to create difficulties in carving out Andhra State

(Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

out of the areas in Madras; they did not want to get into any dispute; they wanted an Andhra State with undisputed Telugu areas in Madras, this was the reason why they did not take up this case of Bellary or any other area wherever there was dispute.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—It is not that they did not refer to it. They said that Bellary belonged to Kannada area. They were not indifferent.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—It was only due to their anxiety and their desire to have their own State for the well-being of Andhras they did not take up this issue. So they were willing to have Andhra State with undisputed areas in Madras. That is the reason why they did not take up this issue.

Sri B. T. KEMPARAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—I want one clarification. In the areas where the Andhra State will be formed, are there no other people who speak other languages except Telugu?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I agree. I must recall to a statement issued by Sri Sanjeeva Reddy who is going to be the Premier or Chief Minister of Andhra to the effect that he will never want one Kannadiga or one inch of Kannada land, or one Tamilian or one inch of Tamil land to come to Andhra against the will and against the expressed wish of that particular individual.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—What a fanaticism!

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—So, I must tell the Members of this august Assembly through you that Andhra people are not anxious to acquire or conquer any land. They do not want to follow the principle of Hitler to have grater Andhra just to exploit Non-Andhras. What they only want is that their brethren who live in different States to come to their own State.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Are we not your brethren?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—When you are thinking of forming a State, it is but natural, it is but right and it is but proper that Andhra State should be formed and they should have their nationals who live in other parts of India to come together.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Are Andhras a nation by themselves?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Yes, a nation by themselves. We are a nation by ourselves. We have Andhra culture.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—It is a nation within a nation.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—It has been accepted on all hands that people who speak different languages have been termed different nationalities. If anybody wants some information, they may collect it from Russia where there are people who speak different languages and they are called different nationalities. It is only just to give an impetus for the improvement of their culture, for the improvement or development of their language and for the improvement of the people who live in that area. Sometime back, I was telling that Misra Report was only a report and not an award. He has clearly stated, Sir, especially with regard to Bellary that he has given his verdict not on the basis of facts but on the basis of the Memorandum submitted to Justice Misra by the Government of Mysore. I would like to quote what has been said here. The Mysore Government in their Memorandum have pointed out that the deficit in respect of the taluks to be transferred to them would be proportionately larger than that of the taluks to be transferred to Andhra and this unfavourable position would be appreciably mitigated if Bellary taluk is addad to Mysore. It would be worth quoting the facts and figures given by the Mysore Government in its memorandum.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Are you against Mysore Government?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am not against Mysore Government as it is. But when these seven taluks are going to be transferred to Mysore on the basis of language, is it not right, is it not my duty, is it not my privilege, I ask the Members of this House, to claim.....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I have done a distinct service to my Hon'ble

friend because his leadership is going to be strengthened.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—...... or to aspire to join our national homeland which is going to come into being on the 1st of October 1953 ? It would be worth quoting the facts and figures given by Mysore Government in its memorandum. It is as follows: 'I do not want to burden you with other things that has been stated. What has been driven at by the Mysore Government Memorandum is that without the Bellary taluk, the deficit that would accrue to Mysore Government on account of the transfer of six taluks would be much more than what it would be if this Bellary taluk with an income of Rs. 10 lakhs sales-tax were not to be given to Mysore State.' So, it is not on the basis of the. language that this has been decided. He has laid stress on the Memorandum presented by the Mysore Government; further, Sir, the other day the Chief Minister in moving this motion was pleased to say that many Andhras, nay about 90 per cent of the people in Bellary taluk, were for the merger of Bellary taluk with Mysore. I must categorically refute that statement. Sir, I know Bellary more intimately than the Chief Minister knows.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.–Intimacy breeds contempt. Therefore it will not be a real picture.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I know facts and figures of Bellary. I know the people of Bellary. I know the mentality of the people of Bellary; I know their wish and desire or anxiety about this issue, Sir. On 30th of April I was at Bellary, one day before Justice Misra arrived.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Perhaps for carrying on agitation !

12-30 P. M.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I must honestly tell you that I did not go to Bellary to kick up any agitation for this purpose. I was only an observer. I went there for my personal work. But I utilised the time or that opportunity to ascertain what exactly the views of the people there were. On that day Comrade Prakasam arrived. The enthusiasm that was there to receive him at the Railway Station, the mile long procession that was there, convinced me that the case of Andhras for the inclusion of Bellary Taluk in the Andhra State was really purposeful.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Had not other leaders been there at the same time ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—When the other leaders, especially the Kannadiga leaders were there, I must say that there was not even 30 per cent of the response that was given to Andhra leaders.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—People from adjoining Districts had come there to receive Sri Prakasam.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—People had come there to create trouble. On the 29th April the Andhra Samithy office was mobbed by people who had come from Gadag and other places; they wanted to burn that office. I must congratulate 3 or 4 persons in that office who defended such a thing. I must categorically say that I do not approve of any violent action in this manner either by the Andhras or by the Kannadigas. It has been made out or it is being said by some members that all the trouble in Bellary was mainly on account of the violent activities or agitation by the Andhras. It is not one way traffic ; it has been indulged in by both Kannada people and Andhra people. What Sri Gopala Gowda referred to the other day "ರಕ್ತಪಾತಂ ಅವುತುಂದಿ" I saw another thing "ಆಂಧ್ರರೆ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ" written on walls. What does it mean ? Blood bath, if you are going to impose a rule on people who are not willing to come into your own. You must always decide the issue by the will of the people :- there is no meaning in imposing a thing on unwilling people. We are proud that the British Empire has fallen, that the Britishers have left India. They cannot rule and nobody can think of ruling over any people against their will. When that is the position, it is not possible for anybody to impose a rule on the people who are not willing to be so ruled. **(A Voice:** This is a quarrel between Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and Sri Gopala Gowda)

(Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

Sri Gopala Gowda has represented a certain point of view and I am representing a certain point of view. There is no quarrel between ourselves. Any position regarding the transfer of territory or asking some people to come into some other State should be decided fairly and squarely and it must be decided in the way in which the people want. The people who speak for Tamilians or Kannadigas propose certain things; sometimes they may exaggerate things. So the best thing would be to decide issue as per the will of the people. How can we decide that issue ? We can only decide the will of the people through a plebiscite. If, as has been stated by some members, Kannada-speaking people predominantly live in Bellary taluk, then why should they be afraid of holding a plebiscite, why should they feel shy of having the issue decided through a plebiscite ? Is it not fair to give a chance ? Here is the proposition. If you are willing to come to Mysore, you may come ; if you are not willing you need not come to Mysore. If you pose that simple problem, I think if the majority of the people are willing to come to Mysore, certainly they can come to Mysore and nobody will have any claim or right to complain against the way in which the fate of the people has been decided. When such an important and vital matter is going to be discussed or decided, when their fate is going to change, it is but right that people themselves should directly be consulted and their wishes ascertained. I am not willing to abide by a decision taken by the representatives of the people. In these vital matters it is the people themselves that must decide.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—If he is not going to take the opinion of the representatives of the people into consideration, how can we here take his view for anything worthwhile ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—There are certain things for which we have the honour to represent, but there are certain things for which the people themselves should be consulted ; it should be done with the concensus of opinion of the people. If you go against the people, if you go against the current, if you go against the desire or will of the people, I may tell the Hon'ble Minister, he will be swept away.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is the danger he should guard against himself from. That is what he is doing. When he is saying that Andhras are a nation and things like that, it is he who has endangered himself and he should take care of himself. (Laughter).

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—We all depend on the will of the people and on their sweet will. If they ask us not to come to this Assembly, we cannot come. We cannot displease them, we cannot go against the will of the people or the wishes of the people. If such a vital matter is to be decided, it is but right that people should decide the issue on the basis of plebiscite ; they must have full opportunity of discussing this issue and deciding it. When that is the case, I am not prepared to accept Misra's report or award. It is always open to the Boundary Commission to go into the question again and decide the issue through a plebiscite.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—What about this Bill now before us ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am not coming to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So the Hon'ble Member proposes to offer his remarks again when the Bill is taken into consideration ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I will take another chance. Regarding the transfer of the seven taluks to Mysore, which is going to be an accomplished fact, when that has been conceded, it is but right that provision should have been made in this Bill for the transfer of Telugu-speaking people who are contiguous to the Andhra State......

Sri J MOHAMED IMAM.—People to be transferred ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—With the territory, I may add, with Bangalore City.

Another important point is regarding the sharing of assets and liabilities and Tungabhadra Project. Tungabhadra Project is one of the important river

valley projects in India, a project which was thought of and which was put into effect mainly for the development and improvement of the Rayalaseema area in the Madras Presidency. This project was undertaken by the Madras Government and the Hyderabad Government. The purpose for which this project was undertaken should not be lost sight of. So in that way the main purpose for which the project was taken should have to be fulfilled and the seven taluks which are going to be transferred should get their reasonable share of the benefit. The cost of this project has been enormous. As the Government of India have not borne any share in this river valley project, it is but right that they should bear the entire cost that has been incurred by the Madras Government. The administration and further development of Tungabhadra Project should be in the hands of a Joint Board representing Mysore, Andhra, Hyderabad and the Central Government. The Joint Board should, at the earliest possible time, take up further improvement, further construction and further development of the project, especialy the high level canal there. There is an area of 92,000 acres under the low level canal, which we are going to get. Out of these 92,000 acres, only 20 000 acres will be wet and the remaining 72,000 acres will be dry cultivation. So, this high level canal, when it is taken up, is going to provide water at least for the cultivation of one lakh of acres. So it is very important that the further work on this project should be taken up at the earliest possible time. The Government of Mysore should do their best to influence the Central Government to give top priority to this, in view of famine in Mysore State and in view of the deficit that we have to incur owing to the merger of Bellary and in view of the fact that we have to incur another equal sum to bring Bellary to our State improvement level. In view of all these things, the Central Government should be induced to bear all the costs, and further to take up the hydro-electric project and the work of the high level canal. I have finished, Sir. Regarding other matters, I would like to speak at the consideration stage of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The programme for Monday will be as follows: The session will commence at 1 P.M., from 1 to 2 P.M. Questions and Answers; 2 to 3-15 P.M. General debate on the Andhra Bill; 3-15 to 4 P.M. Chief Minister's reply; 4 to 4-30 P.M. interval and 4-30 to 5-30 P.M. Consideration motion of the Andhra Bill.

The House will rise for the day and meet on Monday at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned for the day at Forty-five minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again on Monday, the 27th July 1953 at One of the Clock.

WD 4516—GPB—500—19-2-54